UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/535,183	01/12/2006	Yasuaki Honda	272287US6PCT	2364

22850 7590 07/08/2009

OBLON, SPIVAK, MCCLELLAND MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.
1940 DUKE STREET
ALEXANDRIA, VA 22314

EXAMINER	
SETO, JEFFREY K	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2458	

NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
07/08/2009	ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

patentdocket@oblon.com
oblonpat@oblon.com
jgardner@oblon.com

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/535,183	HONDA ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Jeffrey Seto	2458	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *21 April 2009*.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-9,13-23 and 27* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-9,13-23 and 27* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date *5-17-05*.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1-9, 13-23 & 27 are pending.

Response to Amendment

2. In response to the Amendment filed on 4-21-09:

a. The Information Disclosure Statement (IDS) submitted on 5-17-05 has been considered by the examiner; and,

b. The objections to claims 1, 6, 10, 13, 14, 20, 21 & 26 have been withdrawn.

Response to Arguments

3. Applicant's arguments filed 4-21-09 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Regarding Applicant's that the "routing table" of Lockridge does not equate to Applicant's "MAC list". Lockridge makes it clear that a list of MAC addresses is used during configuration (See paragraph 20, line 7).

4. Regarding Applicant's argument that Lockridge does not teach the new limitations added to claim 1 by the current Amendment. This argument is moot in view of the new grounds of rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

1. Claims 1-9, 13-23 & 27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0110240 to Lockridge, et al. (Lockridge), in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,865,673 issued to Nessett, et al. (Nessett).

2. Regarding claim 1, Lockridge teaches an information processing apparatus for connecting to a network to which a plurality of devices are connected, and executing a process of generating an access control list, comprising: a reception unit for receiving a packet from a client that serves as an access requesting apparatus through the network (See paragraph 19, lines 5-17; wherein the reception unit is in the router and receives the ARP packet); a storage unit storing a MAC list in which information for one client is set as registration data for one slot (See par. 16, lines 1-7; wherein memory 220 is the storage unit); a registration permission judgment unit for confirming whether or not there is an empty slot in the MAC list and judging that a registration is permitted only if there is the empty slot in the MAC list, in a client registration process based on a received packet at the reception unit (See par. 20, lines 5-10; wherein there is an "empty slot" when there is no other device with a conflicting MAC address); and a registration processing unit for acquiring data containing a client MAC address from the received packet and executing a registration process for the MAC list, in accordance with a judgment of the registration permission by the registration permission judgment unit

(See par. 20, line 7, and par. 21, lines 14-16; wherein the MAC list is in the routing table).

Lockridge does not teach the MAC list being composed of a pre-determined number of slots that define a corresponding predetermined number of clients that are granted permission to access the information processing apparatus. However, Nessett teaches, the MAC list being composed of a pre-determined number of slots that define a corresponding predetermined number of clients that are granted permission to access the information processing apparatus (See col. 1, lines 46-47, and col. 5, lines 42-45; wherein only pre-authorized devices/clients are allowed to be installed, which equates to a pre-determined number of slots corresponding to a predetermined number of clients). Using the features of Nessett in the system of Lockridge would have provided system control regarding which devices were allowed to connect to the system and regarding the total number of devices that were allowed to connect. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time of the invention, to combine the teachings of Nessett with Lockridge.

3. Regarding claim 2, Lockridge, in view of Nessett, teach the invention as described in claim 1. Lockridge further teaches the registration processing unit is configured to acquire a sender MAC address contained in a header field of the packet received from the client (See par. 19, lines 17-22; wherein the MAC and other addresses are in the header of the ARP packet) and adopts the acquired sender MAC address as registration information of the MAC list (See par. 21, lines 14-16).

4. Regarding claim 3, Lockridge, in view of Nessett, teach the invention as described in claim 1. Lockridge further teaches a packet analysis unit for judging whether the packet received from the client is a registration processing request packet or a data processing request packet (See par. 19, lines 15-17; wherein scanning and determining is the equivalent of analyzing and judging); and characterized in that: if the packet received from the client is the registration processing request packet, the registration permission judgment unit executes a registration permission judgment process in accordance with a presence/absence detection process for the empty slot in the MAC address (See par. 20, lines 5-10); and the registration processing unit executes a registration process in accordance with the judgment of the registration permission by the registration permission judgment unit (See par. 21, lines 14-16).

5. Regarding claim 4, Lockridge, in view of Nessett, teach the invention as described in claim 1. Lockridge further teaches if the packet received from the client is the data processing packet, the registration permission judgment unit executes the registration permission judgment process in accordance with the presence/absence detection process for the empty slot in the MAC address (See par. 18, lines 4-7); and the registration processing unit executes the registration process for the MAC list in accordance with the judgment of the registration permission by the registration permission judgment unit, by acquiring the data containing the client MAC address from the received data processing request packet (See par. 20, lines 5-10, and par. 21, lines 14-16).

6. Regarding claim 5, Lockridge in view of Nessett teach the invention as described in claim 1. Lockridge does not teach the control unit executes a close process for the empty slot under a condition that a lapse time from a setting process for the empty slot in the MAC list exceeds a predetermined threshold time. However, Nessett teaches this limitation (See column 4, lines 20-25). Using the time limit of Nessett in the system of Lockridge would have made a more efficient system, by not allowing the registration process to wait unnecessarily on a device that was not functioning properly. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time of the invention, to combine the teachings of Nessett and Lockridge.

7. Regarding claim 6, Lockridge, in view of Nessett, teach the invention as described in claim 1. Lockridge does not teach the registration permission judgment unit is configured to execute a process of judging whether or not a data processing request sequence from the client correctly and reliably executes a sequence in conformity with a UPnP protocol; and the registration processing unit is configured to execute the registration process for the MAC list in accordance with a judgment that the data processing request sequence from the client correctly and reliably executes the sequence in conformity with a UPnP protocol. However, Nessett teaches this limitation (See col. 2, lines 51-53). Using the plug and play protocol of Nessett in the system of Lockridge would have broadened the appeal of the system by allowing for the addition of popular plug and play devices. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time of the invention, to combine the teachings of Nessett and Lockridge.

8. Regarding claim 7, Lockridge, in view of Nessett, teach the invention as described in claim 1. Lockridge does not teach the registration permission judgment unit judges whether a content directory service (CDS) request process in the sequence in conformity with the UPnP protocol is executed or not in response to a data processing request from the client; and the registration processing unit is configured to execute the registration process for the MAC list in accordance with a judgment that the content directory service (CDS) request process is executed, by acquiring the data containing the client MAC address from the received data processing request packet. However, Nessett teaches this limitation (See col. 2, lines 51-53; wherein a content delivery service request, such as a request for a movie from a video service, would be treated the same as any other data request; meaning that it would not trigger the registration process). Using the plug and play protocol of Nessett in the system of Lockridge would have broadened the appeal of the system by allowing for the addition of popular plug and play devices. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time of the invention, to combine the teachings of Nessett and Lockridge.

9. Regarding claim 8, Lockridge, in view of Nessett, teach the invention as described in claim 1. Lockridge further teaches the registration processing unit is configured to execute the registration process for the MAC list by acquiring the MAC address and identification information different from the MAC address stored in the packet received from the client (See par. 20, lines 5-10; wherein the IP address is the different ID information).

10. Regarding claim 9, Lockridge, in view of Nessett, teach the invention as described in claim 8. Lockridge further teaches the identification information different from the MAC address is identification information of global unique ID information or key information set to a client apparatus (See par. 20, lines 5-10; wherein the IP address is the global ID).

11. Regarding claim 13, Lockridge teaches a server client system for connecting to a network to which a plurality of devices are connected and receiving an access request, comprising: a client configured to, detect an activation of a communication process in the network based on a power-on process or an activation of a specific application, and generating and transmitting an access control list registration processing request packet storing own MAC address in header information by using the detected information as a trigger (See par. 19, lines 5-11, and par. 20, lines 6-8; wherein when "the device attempts to communicate with another networked device" is equivalent to power on or activation); and a server configured to receive the access control registration processing request packet from the client through the network, confirm whether or not there is an empty slot in a MAC list which sets information including a MAC address of one client as registration data for one slot, execute a registration process of registering client information based on the packet in the MAC list, only if there is the empty slot in the MAC list (See par. 20, line 6, to par. 21, line 16).

Lockridge does not teach the MAC list being composed of a pre-determined number of slots that define a corresponding predetermined number of clients that are granted permission to access the information processing apparatus. However, Nessett

teaches, the MAC list being composed of a pre-determined number of slots that define a corresponding predetermined number of clients that are granted permission to access the information processing apparatus (See col. 1, lines 46-47, and col. 5, lines 42-45; wherein only pre-authorized devices/clients are allowed to be installed, which equates to a pre-determined number of slots corresponding to a predetermined number of clients). Using the features of Nessett in the system of Lockridge would have provided system control regarding which devices were allowed to connect to the system and regarding the total number of devices that were allowed to connect. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time of the invention, to combine the teachings of Nessett with Lockridge.

12. Regarding claim 14, Lockridge, in view of Nessett, teach the invention as described in claim 13. Lockridge further teaches the server is configured to execute a process of acquiring a sender MAC address contained in a header field on a packet received from the client and adopt the acquired sender MAC address as registration information for the MAC list (See par. 21, lines 14-16).

13. Regarding claim 15, Lockridge teaches an information processing method of generating an access control list in a router, comprising: connecting, with a connecting unit in a router, to a network to which a plurality of devices are connected; receiving, with a receiving unit in the router, a packet from a client that serves as an access requesting apparatus (See par. 19, lines 5-8); judging, with a judgment unit in the router, whether or not there is an empty slot in a MAC list in which information of a MAC list for one client is set as registration data for one slot (See par. 20, lines 6-10; wherein there

is an empty slot when there is no conflict); and acquiring, with an acquiring unit in the router, data containing a client MAC address from the received packet and executing a registration process for the MAC list, in accordance with the judging only if there is the empty slot in the MAC list (See par. 21, lines 14-16).

Lockridge does not teach the MAC list being composed of a pre-determined number of slots that define a corresponding predetermined number of clients that are granted permission to access the router. However, Nessett teaches, the MAC list being composed of a pre-determined number of slots that define a corresponding predetermined number of clients that are granted permission to access the information processing apparatus (See col. 1, lines 46-47, and col. 5, lines 42-45; wherein only pre-authorized devices/clients are allowed to be installed, which equates to a pre-determined number of slots corresponding to a predetermined number of clients). Using the features of Nessett in the system of Lockridge would have provided system control regarding which devices were allowed to connect to the system and regarding the total number of devices that were allowed to connect. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time of the invention, to combine the teachings of Nessett with Lockridge.

14. Regarding claim 16, Lockridge, in view of Nessett, teach the invention as described in claim 15. Lockridge further teaches the registration processing step execute a process of acquiring a sender MAC address contained in a header field of the packet received from the client, and adopting the acquired sender MAC address as registration information of the MAC list (See par. 19, lines 17-22).

15. Regarding claim 17, Lockridge, in view of Nessett, teach the invention as described in claim 15. Lockridge further teaches a packet analysis step of judging whether the packet received from the client is a registration processing request packet or a data processing request packet (See par. 18, lines 4-7, and par. 19, lines 5-8); and characterized in that: if it is judged at the packet analysis step that the packet received from the client is the registration processing request packet, the registration permission judgment step executes a registration permission judgment process in accordance with a presence/absence detection process for the empty slot in the MAC address (See par. 20, lines 5-10).

16. Regarding claim 18, Lockridge, in view of Nessett, teach the invention as described in claim 15. Lockridge further teaches if the packet received from the client is the data processing packet, the registration permission judgment step executes the registration permission judgment process in accordance with the presence/absence detection process for the empty slot in the MAC address (See par. 18, lines 4-7, and par. 19, lines 5-8); and the registration processing unit step executes the registration process for the MAC list in accordance with the judgment of the registration permission by the registration permission judgment unit, by acquiring the data containing the client MAC address from the received data processing request packet (See par. 20, lines 5-10).

17. Regarding claim 19, Lockridge, in view of Nessett, teach the invention as described in claim 15. Lockridge does not teach a control step of executing a close process for the empty slot under a condition that a lapse time from a setting process for

the empty slot in the MAC list exceeds a predetermined threshold time. However, Nessett teaches this limitation (See column 4, lines 20-25). Using the time limit of Nessett in the system of Lockridge would have made a more efficient system, by not allowing the registration process to wait unnecessarily on a device that was not functioning properly. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time of the invention, to combine the teachings of Nessett and Lockridge.

18. Regarding claim 20, Lockridge, in view of Nessett, teach the invention as described in claim 15. Lockridge does not teach the registration permission judgment step includes a step of judging whether or not a data processing request sequence from the client correctly and reliably executes a sequence in conformity with a UPnP protocol; and the registration processing step executes the registration process for the MAC list by acquiring the data containing the client MAC address from the packet received from the client in accordance with a judgment that the data processing request sequence from the client correctly and reliably executes the sequence in conformity with a UPnP protocol. However, Nessett teaches this limitation (See col. 2, lines 51-53). Using the plug and play protocol of Nessett in the system of Lockridge would have broadened the appeal of the system by allowing for the addition of popular plug and play devices. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time of the invention, to combine the teachings of Nessett and Lockridge.

19. Regarding claim 21, Lockridge, in view of Nessett, teach the invention as described in claim 15. Lockridge does not teach the registration permission judgment step includes a step of judging whether a content directory service (CDS) request

process in the sequence in conformity with the UPnP protocol is executed or not in response to a data processing request from the client; and the registration processing step executes the registration process for the MAC list in accordance with a judgment that the content directory service (CDS) request process is executed, by acquiring the data containing the client MAC address from the packet received from the client. However, Nessett teaches this limitation (See col. 2, lines 51-53; wherein a content delivery service request, such as a request for a movie from a video service, would be treated the same as any other data request; meaning that it would not trigger the registration process). Using the plug and play protocol of Nessett in the system of Lockridge would have broadened the appeal of the system by allowing for the addition of popular plug and play devices. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time of the invention, to combine the teachings of Nessett and Lockridge.

20. Regarding claim 22, Lockridge, in view of Nessett, teach the invention as described in claim 15. Lockridge further teaches the registration processing step executes the registration process for the MAC list by acquiring the MAC address and identification information different from the MAC address stored in the packet received from the client (See par. 20, lines 5-10; wherein the IP address is the different identification information).

21. Regarding claim 23, Lockridge, in view of Nessett, teach the invention as described in claim 15. Lockridge further teaches the identification information different from the MAC address is identification information of global unique ID information or key

information set to a client apparatus (See par. 20, lines 5-10; wherein the IP address is the global ID).

22. Regarding claim 27, Lockridge teaches a computer readable storage medium encoded with instructions, which when executed configure a router to generate an access control list method comprising: connecting, with a connecting unit in the router, to a network to which a plurality of devices are connected, and receiving a packet from a client that serves as an access requesting apparatus (See par. 19, lines 5-8); judging, with a judging unit in the router, whether or not there is an empty slot in a MAC list in which information of a MAC list for one client is set as registration data for one slot (See par. 20, lines 6-10); and acquiring, with an acquiring unit in the router, data containing a client MAC address from the received packet and executing a registration process for the MAC list, in accordance with the judging, only if there is the empty slot in the MAC list (See par. 21, lines 14-17).

Lockridge does not teach the MAC list being composed of a pre-determined number of slots that define a corresponding predetermined number of clients that are granted permission to access the router. However, Nessett teaches, the MAC list being composed of a pre-determined number of slots that define a corresponding predetermined number of clients that are granted permission to access the information processing apparatus (See col. 1, lines 46-47, and col. 5, lines 42-45; wherein only pre-authorized devices/clients are allowed to be installed, which equates to a pre-determined number of slots corresponding to a predetermined number of clients). Using the features of Nessett in the system of Lockridge would have provided system

control regarding which devices were allowed to connect to the system and regarding the total number of devices that were allowed to connect. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time of the invention, to combine the teachings of Nessett with Lockridge.

Conclusion

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Jeffrey Seto whose telephone number is (571)270-7198. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday thru Thursday and alt. Fridays, 9:30 AM-7 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Joseph E. Avellino can be reached on (571) 272-3905. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

JKS
7/1/2009

/Joseph E. Avellino/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2458